P. F. 56 of 96

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1895-96.

~~192~~.

(L. R.)

File No. 128 of 95

Serial Nos. 1 to 7

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 1 to 7

~~Part~~ B for May 1897.

SUBJECT.

Dispute regarding the Mauthenji of Nirgunda in the Haveri Taluk.

Endorsed N/B

WD 2233—GPB—20,000 14-6-20

Genealogical Table

Nādiy Nailari Sammaiya.

- (Name not known)
  - Krishnappa
    - Timmappaiya
      - Giriyappa
        - Timmappaiya
          - Venkatāramanaiya
            - Khandeppa
          - Narasappaiya
            - Ramakrishnaiya
- Giriyanna
  - Somaiya
    - Mallannaiya
      - Naranappa
        - Sitāramaiya
          - Mallannaiya
            - Khandyappa (or Khandeppa)
  - Sitāramaiya
    - Puttaiya
      - Shāmanna
        - Timmappaiya
          - Venkatākrishnaiya
            - Timmappaiya
          - Sitaramaiy
            - Giri

(4)

Genealogical Table
(Filed by Rangayya)



3

(6)

Before the Government of Mysore.

Appeal No. 2 of 1896-97.

Appellants.	Vs.	Respondents.
1. Ranganna		1. Gowramma
2. Khandappa		2. Chik Khandappa

Dispute regarding the Shanbhogi of Nirugunda Kirtie in the Arsikere Taluk.

List of papers in English.

(1) Appeal petition
(2) Official Memorandum
(3) Deputy Commr's report
(4) Genealogical table (according to 1st Appellt)
(5) Do (" 1st Respdt)

It is hard to disturb Ranganna who has been doing the work for the last eight or ten years & there is [illegible] Gowramma has appealed – the registry [illegible] two appeal against that order – the name of Gowramma [illegible] therefore continues in the [illegible] of her adopted son till she establishes the right – will be transferred in which case the registry till then is done on [illegible] in his name – Ranganna [illegible] life of Gowramma [illegible] 19 Gowramma [illegible] a former order [illegible] 21st as father maintenance [illegible] fixed by the Dy Comr. To same [illegible] handle 15 Gowramma [illegible] amount will be paid out of the [illegible] when devised out of the allowance [illegible]

15/12/[illegible]

[illegible signature]

1896 (1)

Stamp affixed
in Tiruppattur
Council case

No. 2506.

Name of Petitioner, Ramasamiah Thevar

Village, Karaikudi

Taluk, Sivaganga

District, Madura.

Date of Arri. 4th June 1896.

Date of Receipt, 4th June 1896.

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, Three.

ABSTRACT.

This is an appeal against order No. 1270, dated 22/4/96 passed by the Deputy Commissioner of Madura District.

The grounds of appeal are,—

That the order No. 1270 dated 22.4.96 passed by the Deputy Commissioner of Madura suspending the Karaikudi Village Panchayatdar of Karaikudi Kottai Sivaganga Taluk, against which the Clause 3 Section 43 of the Local Revenue

Revenue Rules.

2. That the Thanbogue of the said "Inka" was in the name of ~~[illegible]~~ Girigauna the 1st Defendant, but he was dismissed on account of his having been convicted of the offence of criminal breach of trust as a public servant.

3. That Ramanaiah the husband of the 2nd Defendant was the Thanbogue of the said "Inka" prior to the Defendant, but he was also dismissed as he ran away after committing the offence of [illegible] the offence of criminal misappropriation.

4. That in 56-57, the then Jamabandy officer ordered that the "Inka" under quotation should be split and amalgamated with the other adjoining Inkas as there is no one to look after the [illegible] and thus much inconvenience is felt. So the appellant found that when the above order the Thanbogue [illegible] will be given away to others, he applied to the [illegible] and executed a [illegible] for the same having the own property as is evidently [illegible] since then the duties of the Thanbogue were conducted by the appellant and the truth of it is admitted in order No. 276.

5. That the 1st and 2nd defendants have no claim as they are criminals and at the same time they have lost all their right to the Thanbogue. Notwithstanding the Dy. Commissioner has in his order No. 1405 [illegible] ordered ~~that~~ the Thanbogue should be registered in the name of the 1st defendant in preference to the 2nd defendant or his wife [illegible] alone and their [illegible] contrary to [illegible] of the Land Revenue Rules.

6. That the Amildar of [illegible] Arasikere has in accordance with the Deputy Commissioner's order given on order No. [illegible] of [illegible] stating that the Deputy Commissioner has rejected the statement of the 1st defendant and ordered that the 1st appellant alone should look after the work in future, and that he should [illegible] his village for the maintenance

6

maintenance of the Vtr. dep

7. That on the complain
of the Vtr. defendant, t
deputy Commissioner has
again, given an order c
contrary to the one give
by him previously to th
Vtr. appellant - and it is again
section 43. para 5. of the Land
Revenue Rules - as also
section 221 of the L. R. C.

8. That the appellant prays
that the entire Records of the
Case may be sent for and
perused - and that the deputy
Commissioner's order No.
1276. may be reversed. Furthe
the appellant prays that the
order No. 148. of 8/2/95 the deputy
Commr. may be upheld
and that the appellant may
be allowed to look after
the duties of the said is
thamboge pending the
disposal of his appeal.

The enclosures of the
appeal petition are;—
1. Copy of order No. 1276 of
22. 4. 96, from the deputy
Commissioner Hassan,
& the Amildar of Arsikere
and it is as follows;—
"That Mr. Cunniah has
decided

decided that the Khandige
land under discussion,
should be registered
in the name of Sowrammah (i.e. the first deft.)
and that a Sunnada should
be had from the Cutcherry
of her husband.

(2). That Sowrammah's
request to have a Sunnada
from her father's family,
is rejected - and at the
same time it is ordered
that Rangannah who
has hitherto acted as
Sunnada - and did his
duties satisfactorily,
should continue Each.
Sowrammah the Petitioner
did not consent to the above
arrangement - and wanted
to have one Chikka Khandige
a Cousin of her husband, as
her Sunnada; but as
which Rangamma and
Doda Khandiappa, objected
and stated that they are the
nearest Cousins being ~~of~~
Dasanatteyatis, and
C. Khandiappa being
only a "Dasanatteyati"
whereas Sowrammah
states that C. Khandiappa
is as good a Dasanatte-
-yati" - as Rangamma
is - and that Sootakas (customs)
are observed accordingly -
... ... it is not proper
as

as to which of the above statements is true. Under the former order the right of the electing Jamadar is vested in Government who does not clearly say as to who the married Sardar is. Either the parties had a ~~difficult time~~ per mamlatdar's advice ~~interviews~~, & effected a compromise, yet they do not appear to have any explanation for it - and the Collector says there is. Consequently it is hereby ordered that order No 14 dt 7.7.95, may be revised - and that the petitioner may be allowed to have C. Khandiba as her Jamadar.

(2). Order No 160 dt 6.8.95, from the Mamlatdar of Karmala stating that one in future he is the Jamadar of Government - as he has conducted the duties of the Thanbaga satisfactorily and he is to pay Rs 21 only of his salary, to Government for her maintenance and that he has received an order No 145 dt 2-8-95, from the Collector for the same.

(3) Copy of order No 14 dt

by d.c. of 75, from the 24th
Commissioner Kadian
& the decision of Gradish
and it is & the following
Heads —

Ramachiah, Rangamma
B. Subbanna, and Sivamma
are present — and they are
examined.

It is stated that the
Plaintiff Rangamma
Died, was for a long
time in the enjoyment
of Ramachiah — the husband
of Sowbhagya — the Pltff,
and that the defendants
Sivamma — and the
contesting parties in
Sivamma and Padda
Khandiahah and others,
are distant Cousins
Viz of the same family
and the Plaintiff under
Coupplaint, was within
their enjoyment &
formerly — or that of their
ancestors. Rangamma
Daughter of Khandiahah
is doing the duties of
the said Plaintiff, since
1857 — and his Affidavit
Dt is an acting one.
All the parties do not
admit that of Rangamma
is the adopted Son of formerly
husband

husband. The Chamboyee
therefore the registered
in the name of Sowramma
who is the nearest heir
of Sivaramma who was the
Chamboyee at the end - and of
himself dismissed. When
the truth of adoption is
ascertained and reported
the Baramahal may be
laid in the boy's name.
X Notice the petition
of Sowrammah & look
for a competent Sannada from
among the Cousins
of her husband - and of
intimate the same; & when
it is done - a report should
be made as to his fitness.
If the Sowrammah fails
to report as above - a
Sannada will be obtained
by Government. A report
should be made about it.
Petitioner should be informed that while there
are Cousins in her husband's
line, she cannot look for
a Sannada from among
the relatives of her father.

10

No. Rl-88 Land Rev. 2 Sept 96 20-08-96

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE, 13-7-96

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM. (2)

11

L.R. 128-95-2

The accompanying Petition No. 4106
dated 24th June 96 received at the
Dewan's Office from Rangappa and his fathe
Khandige Karianna praying
Sale application under section
of the Land Revenue Act 1876 &
in respect of Kallahalla Kere-
gunda Jerika, Arsikere Taluk
is forwarded, together with its 3
enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner
Hassan District for submission of
the Sister proceedings connected
with the Case in Reference a file
report of the Tahsildar of the Case and the
the remarks noted on the Petition
& petition and its
Enclosures should be returned

By Order,

Bangalore,
13-7-1896.

Asst. to Chief Secretary.

Asst
10/7

Asst
10/7

963

Gen. Serial No. 50.]

(3)

GT. MYSORE 4533

REVENUE DEWAN'S OFFICE 9 JAN. 97

1897

From

The Commissioner,
Hassan District

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Government Dewan of Mysore.
General and Judicial

Dated
Despatched
Received } 7 January 1897

Enclosures No. Petition & 1 P. file

General No.
No. 635

In reply to your C/65 dated 11th Dec. 1896.

SUBJECT.

Submitting petition from Kanagappa and two later Khandayas of Kannadiahi appealing against Dewan's order regarding the office of Shanbhogi of Hiragunda Pirka, Hassan Taluk.

References—(to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Submitted with reference to the Revenue Councillor's order on the abstract of proceedings of 24-6-96.

12

H 18/1/97 L. R. 128-95-3

The question for decision is whether appellant who had been doing the duties of Shanbogue annulla for about 8 years satisfactorily Could be removed with propriety, in order to meet the wishes of the Respondent Shanbogue (a woman)

Sd/ D. 21/1 Commr
19/1/97

Recd Pln.
19/1/97.

I think it is hard that Kanagappa should be dismissed & his son be appointed & the villagers all concerned

Sd/
20/1/97

Office
Pl. up for
perusal

Mr 21/1

Noted for hearing on 12th Feb.
Mr 22/1

Sd/
22/1

Rev
9-1-97

Before (14)
Mr 1

Submitted with reference
16/1

No. 635
Regd

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Hassan District
Hassan Dated 7th January 1897

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Hassan District

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
General and Revenue Departments
Bangalore

Sir,

With reference to your official memorandum No. Rev 65 dated 11th July 1896 forwarding for report, Petition No. 4106 dated 21st June 1896 from Ringappa and his father Khandappa of Karanhalli, Arsikere Taluk, appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner No. 1276 dated 22nd April 1896, regarding the Shanbhogi of Neerganda Pirka, Arsikere Taluk, I have the honour to report as follows:—

2. Paper No. 30 in the file shows that one Thimmappaya, who was Shanbhoge of the Neerganda Pirka, claimed exemption enjoyment of certain Government lands and that

that on the complaint of his brother Giriyappa, the then Amildar reported that he had ordered the said Thimmappaiya to produce some records, but he absconded dropping a petition to the effect that as he was absent in Benares on pilgrimage, his brother Giriyappa might be appointed in his place. Thereupon it was ordered in No 396 dated 27th October 1862, that Giriyappa might be appointed to act for the said Thimmappaiya.

3. Paper No 32 in the file shows that Giriyappa was charged of embezzlement and convicted and dismissed the service in or about the year 1880.

4. Paper No 36 in the file shows that Thimmappaiya urged his claims to the Shanbhogi which fell vacant on account of the dismissal of Giriyappa, and it was ordered in No 2230 dated 25th February 1880, that he could not be given the appointment as he had admitted in the Criminal case against Giriyappa, before the General Assistant Commissioner, that

that he had been dismissed from the Shanbhagi on the complaint of Lingayits

5. Then one Subbanna appears to have been appointed, but he did not present himself for duty

6. On Ramanappayá further representation, his nephew one Ramanna, was appointed Shanbhoge by Colonel Hill in December 1880, as the innocence of Thimmappayya had not been made out. Ramanna resigned the appointment on 29th September 1881.

7. On 6th March 1882, Amildar Khader Ali of the Hassan Taluk recommended that Thimmappayya the dismissed Shanbhoge might be reappointed. This was not approved by the then Deputy Commissioner Mr. C. Krishna Murti, (Vide order No 864 dated 2nd August 1882. Copy No 34 in the file)

8. The several persons that acted for the Shanbhagi from 1862 to the end of December 1882 are mentioned in paper No 110.

9. As the Firka was subsequently transferred to the Arsikere Taluk the records were sent to that Amildar for report with the observation that it was necessary to give the appointment to a relative of the Shanbhoge and that the best and reliable man available may be selected

10. On 20th August 1883, Gouramma, wife of Thimmappaiya, petitioned the Sub Division Officer that her husband Thimmappaiya left the village some two months ago without telling any one, and that it was since reported that he had gone on pilgrimage, and as she was destitute she prayed that her adopted son Ananta Ramaiya might be registered as Shanbhoge, her nephew one Nanjappa being appointed his Gumasta.

11. The Amildar thereupon in his No. 728 dated 22nd August 1883 reported that the dismissed and convicted Shanbhoges Giriyappa and Thimmappaiya (who was reported to be

be absent on pilgrimage), had no issue nor even near collateral heirs; that one kudumagudi Venkatramanaya nephew (sister's son) of the above and 3 other distant cousins offered themselves as candidates for the Shanbhogi; that the distant cousins would not leave their native places and reside in the Firka and that they could not therefore be nominated merely on the ground that they were cousins; that the nephew Venkatramaiya who was competent having knowledge of the accounts might be appointed temporarily as he promised to live in the Firka and tender a security of Rs 200/-.

12. The nomination of Venkatramayya was approved of by the Sub Division Officer Mr. T Ananda Rao on the 27th December 1883 subject to the condition that Venkatramayya should find a residence at Neerguda at once. Mr. Ananda Rao further ordered that an endorsement should be given to Thimmappaiya informing him of the above to give him an opportunity of appealing against the order, if he was dissatisfied with it. Thimmappaiya thereupon

thereupon
appealed to Government, who called for the
Proceedings and gave an endorsement No 2391
dated 16th July 1885 to Thimmappaya rejecting
his petition with the observation that his case
was not deserving of any consideration and
that his antecedents were against him and
his renomination by the Amildar in 1880
was informal and temporary and was still
under the consideration of the District au-
thorities, when one morning Petitioner took
into his head to hang up his duftar to
a nail in his house and start off
to Sonarca without leave obtained from
the Amildar or previous intimation given
to his superiors, whereas, he reappeared
at the end of 6 months and claimed to
have his Shanbhogi given back to him;
and that the claim was therefore dismissed

13. On 20th October 1885 the Amildar
reported that Venkatramana (appointed by
Sir Munro Rao on 27th December 1883) had not
produced

produced proper security; that he had committed several irregularities in the discharge of his duties and that he troubled the ryots a good deal. He therefore recommended that he might be dismissed, one Ramakrishnayya being appointed in his stead. Mr. C. Srinivasiengar, the then acting Sub-Divisional Officer, suspending Venkatramaiyya pending disposal of the charges against him during the ensuing Jamabundi and approved of the nomination of Ramakrishnayya (Vide Orde. No 208 dated 7th November 1885; Paper No 91).

14. This Venkatramaiyya was subsequently charged of criminal breach of trust under sec 409 I. P. Cand was found guilty by the Sessions Judge, in Hassan Sessions Case No 6 of 1887, and sentenced to 3 years' rigorous imprisonment and a fine of 100 Rs.

15. On 6th January 1887, the Amildar reported

pointed that Ramakrishnayya did not want the Shanbhogi and he therefore recommended that one Ranganna son of Khandappa, present appellant, a Kurubar for the Shanbhogi in question, was quite competent to discharge the duties and that he might therefore appointed. Mr T. Ananda Rao, the then Deputy Commissioner, referred the records to the General Assistant Commissioner with the following remark "Temporary arrangement might be approved; the whole matter required attention at the Jamabandi time. It was better to have no Shanbhogs than frequently changing temporary Shanbhogs. Some guarantee shall but certain and tangible should be had that the man (present appellant) would not throw up without notice of 6 months at least. If possible and necessary this Fifth might be added on to the charge of a neighbouring competent man

16. Mr K. Ramachandra Rao the then General

General Assistant Commissioner, accepted the resignation tendered by Ramakrishnayya and appointed Ranganna (appellant) temporarily. He directed the Amildar to produce Ranganna and the records at the ensuing Jamabandi together with the particulars of Jamabandi &c of the neighbouring Talukas.

17. When these were produced before Rao Ramachandra Rao, the matter was not finally disposed of by him, but he called for information as to who were the surviving sons of the late Giriyappa (Barawarddar Shanbhoge shown in the Barabaloti Register of 1867-68) and as to what they would say. He further directed the Amildar to take a Muchilika from Ranganna that he would not throw up the office without 6 months' previous notice. Ranganna accordingly executed a Muchalika on 16th September 1887.

18. On 20th July 1893 Goveramma wife of Thimmappaiya petitioned the Deputy

Deputy Commissioner, that her husband died 3 or 4 years before and that one Ranganna was doing Shanbhogi duties as gumasta appointed by Government. She prayed that her adopted son Ananthia might be registered as Shanbhoge, one Bagade' Subraya being appointed his gumasta. The petition was referred to the Amildar for report. On receipt of the entire Proceedings connected with the Shanbhogi in question, Mr. Purnaiya in his No. 1435 dated 26th May 1895 (Paper No. 171 in the file) passed the following order— "It appears that the Shanbhogi of the Neerganda Pirka was a for a long time in the enjoyment of Gouramma's husband Thimmappaya and his uncle's son Giriyanna. The contending parties to the Shanbhogi viz Ranganna, Giriyanna Khandappa and others, though they belong to this family, are distant cousins. The Shanbhogi was not in their enjoyment nor was it in that Branch of their ancestors from whom they were descend

descended. Though Ranganna has been doing the duties since 1887, Yet he is a man that was appointed temporarily. That Anantha Ranganna was adopted to Gauramma's husband is not admitted by the opposite side and therefore the nearest heir to the last male holder of the Shanbhogi viz Girijamma the dismissed Shanbhoge is Gauramma in whose name the registry must be made. After the fact of adoption is established and the same intimated, the Inamward may be transferred in that boy's name. Notice should be given to Gauramma to select a competent Gumasta out of her husband's cousins and his competency reported. If She fails to do so, a Gumasta should be nominated by Government. Gauramma might also be told that her personal relations could not be preferred to those of her husbands' cousins."

Notice was issued to Gauramma in terms of Hrs Purnaiya's order. She did not select her Gumasta from out of her husband's

Cousins

Commissioner directed but named her own man one Suryanarayappa.

20. Thereupon, Mr Krishnaswami Ayyar in his No 148 dated 2/7 July 1897, passed an order in the following terms:— "Rangamma who has been acting from 1887 without giving any room for complaint, should not be disturbed. She should continue to act as Gumasta. She should pay to Gauramma Rs 2½ which is one third of the Potgi. The boy's adoption must be established in a competent Court."

21. On 18th January 1898 Gauramma again petitioned the Deputy Commissioner that her man Suryanarayappa should be appointed her Gumasta whereupon the late Mr Krishnaswamiyyar ordered that he could not interfere with the orders already passed. If, however, the woman would produce a gumasta from among the cousins of her husband as decided by Mr Cumaraja, he had no objection to appoint him

him.

22. Gouramma thereupon produced one Chikka Khandajpa alleging that he was a cousin of her husband. — Khandajpa and son Ranganna (appellants) urged that Chikka Khandajpa was not descended from their family and produced a genealogical table.

23. The late Mr Krishnaswami Aiyangar passed an order in the following terms on 17th April 1896 :-

"Mr Punnaiya's order not appealed against, and therefore final was that Gouramma should be registered and that she should select a Sanada from among the cousins of her deceased husband. Gouramma was then called upon to produce a Sanada but I refused to appoint him as he was not of the family of the deceased, and Ranganna had been discharging the duties satisfactorily.

Gouramma

Gauramma now produces a gumasta who is a cousin. Rangamma says that he is a distant cousin and only "Thri-nathri gnaty". He is still a cousin and fulfils the condition of being a "gnaty of her husband. There is no restriction in the former order as to nearness or distance. The parties are extremely contentious and would not come to any terms in spite of my best efforts to bring them to the same. Chikka Khan dappa named by Gauramma is accordingly appointed gumasta of Gauramma." This order is now under appeal.

24. The petition and its enclosures received with the official memo under reference, ~~are herewith acknowledged~~, together with the Vernacular papers

papers connected with the case, ending with General Duty assistant Commissioner's Yadi No 112 Dated 27th August 1896, are herewith submitted for needful reference and obliging return.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant.

[redacted]
for Deputy Commissioner
Hassan District

4106

COURT FEE STAMP

Five rupees stamp affixed

MYSORE REVENUE DEPARTMENT
PETITION DEPARTMENT
RECD. ON 4 MAR 1971

13/3/71

ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಸೇರಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವರು ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇದ್ದ ಕಲ್ಲಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಕುಳಿತರು. ಇನ್ನು ಕೆಲವರು ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ನಿಂತರು. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿದ್ದ ಜನರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನವರು ಕೂಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವವರೇ ಆಗಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಬಹಳ ಬಡವರಾಗಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವರು ಹರಿದ ಬಟ್ಟೆಗಳನ್ನು ಧರಿಸಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವರು ಚಪ್ಪಲಿಗಳನ್ನು ಧರಿಸಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವರು ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸದ ಸಲಕರಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿದಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವರು ಕೆಲಸದ ಸಲಕರಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿದಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ

Proceedings of the Court of Bijapore

31

L R 125-95-4

Read

(1) Petition of appeal No. 4106/A.S. 2 of 1896-97, presented by Ranganna and his father Khandappa of Harwahalli, Arsikere Taluk, against the Hassan Dy Comm's. order of 24th April 96, No. 1276, appointing one Chikka-Khandappa the nominee of Ganganna, the registerdar, as Shanbhog Ganmata of the Firka

(2) Letter No. 635 S, 7th May 97, from the Dy Comm's, Hassan &c reporting on the above and submitting the records of the case from which the facts are as follows

One Timmappaiya was the original Shanbhog of the Nerganda Firka and after him

after him his uncle's son
Giriyappa was appointed as
Shanbhog. About the year
1880 this Giriyappa was charged
with embezzlement and convicted
and dismissed the service.
A number of persons acted
as Shanbhogs in succession
to Giriyappa till at last in
June 1887 one Ramakrishnaya
who was then acting as Shanbhog
resigned the office. Thereupon
one Rangamma (the present Petr)
a hyzedar of the Shanbhogs
in question, was, at the re-
-commendation of the then
Amildar, temporarily appointed
to the office.

On 20th July 1893 Gowramma
wife of Timmappaiya petitioned
the Dy Comm^r praying that
her adopted son Amrita Rayarma
might be registered as Shanbhog

one

and that one Bagade Subbaraya being appointed to do the duties as Gumasta. Thereupon Mr Purnaiya, the then Dy Comm ordered that the registry sh be made in the name of Gaura who was the next heir to the las male holder of the Shanbhog viz Giriamma, that the same may be transferred to the name of her adopted son Anantarayan when his adoption was established a the same intimated, that Gauramma should select competent Gumasta out of her husband's cousins and that in default a Gumasta should be nominated by Govt. But Gauramma hav failed to select a Gumas out of her husband's e the late Mr Krishnasami Iyengar ordered that Rang

who had been acting since 1887
without giving any room for
complaint should not be dis-
turbed but should continue to
act as Gumasta and pay to
Gauramma one-third of the
Poligi viz. Rs 21/- for her main-
tenance and that Ananta
Rangama's adoption must
be established in a civil court.

On a subsequent petition
of Gauramma Mr. Krishnasami
Iyengar so far modified his
order as to allow Gauramma to
nominate a Gumasta out
of her husband's cousins
as decided by Mr. Purnaiya.
Gauramma produced
one Chikka Khandappa and
prayed for his nomination as
Gumasta. On 22.4.96 the late
Mr. Krishnasami Iyengar
passed an order appointing
Chikka Khandappa as
Gumasta

34

35

(14th) Encroacher file –

Gaurama in place of Rangama
Since the appeal is given by
Rangama his father Khandia

Rule 1 of 1935
F.F. 56–96 3/11/15 3.11.97

It is hard to return
Rangama who has been doing
the work for the last eight or ten
years. Gaurama has been
registered and there is no
appeal against that order.
The registry therefore continues
in the name of Gaurama
till she establishes the right
of her adopted son in which
case the registry will be
transferred in his name.
Till this is done or during
the life of Gaurama Rangama
should continue as Gaurama's
subject of course to his
discharging ~~the~~ his duties
satisfactorily, paying to
Gaurama for her main-
tenance 2/- as fixed by the

Deputy Commissioner. To
save trouble to Government
this amount will be paid
to her direct out of the Refugee
allowance

3/10

M

C2 & C3 For Secretary

Re-Draft 11/8/97

To The Dy Commissioner
Hassan dt, with records.

Bbn
10/3.

(8)

3 4

ಇಂತಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ

ಸಹಿ/-

ದಿನಾಂಕ 9.3.97 ರಂದು

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

By Order

For Secretary

29



Draft

Bbn.

4/3.

Order.

Reference.

Ent. 7/5/97

£ 19/5/97

40

4.106 of 95

O.M. 56-876.

Ord R

£ 19/5

£ 2-7-5

File put up

Ste 21/5

Sent

£ 22/5/97

To Dy Comm for disposal

ML 25/5/97

Ept. in dupte and put up.

C/K

21/5/97

L.R. 128-95-6.

1897

(10)

No. 3314 97

Name of Petitioner Govindadasa Raja of Bobbili Zamindar

Village Kanugula

Taluk Narasannapeta

District Ganjam

Date of Application 10th May 1897

Date of Receipt 11th May 1897

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil.

ABSTRACT.

Petr states that the applicant's Kanugula tied about a month and a half ago and prays that orders may be given to the Deputy Commissioner Ganjam Khandapeta asher genuista.

Ill

5/15/97

Pet
F.56-96

1 Encl

(1726)

2087-2858

28-5-97

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

12

PETITION DEPARTMENT. (11)

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying ~~Appeal~~ Petition

Registered No. 3314 dated 10-5-97

received at the Dewan's Office from

Gowramma, widow of Timmp
Shanbhog of Tirupura village
Arsikere Taluk praying that
Khandappa may be appointed
as Shanbhog pursuant in place
of Rangappa deceased

L.R. 128-95-7

is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosure~~, to the Deputy Commissioner of Hassan District, for disposal.

By order,

27/5/97

Asst Secretary.

BANGALORE,
26/5/1897
29